Attorney Docket No. 119166.1042 ber 14, 2007 (72-03-025)

Application No.: 10/827,056 Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2007

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-51 are were previously pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23, 28, 30, and 32 have been amended, claims 34-51 have been cancelled without prejudice, and no claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-33 are currently pending in the present application.

I. <u>Drawings</u>

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference "332" mentioned in the description at page 11, line 29. A new replacement sheet for Figure 3 including reference "332" is included.

The Examiner ha also objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings do not show that the "properties file is a spreadsheet" as recited in claims 16, 21, 26, 38, 44, and 50. A replacement drawing sheet for Figure 4 is attached which shows a properties file spreadsheet 409. The specification has also been amended at such that the paragraph the beings on page 15 at line 19 includes a reference to the attribute-link properties spreadsheet 409.

Neither the amendment to the specification for the paragraph beginning at page 15 line 19 nor the amendments to the drawings indicated in replacement sheets for Figures 3 and 4 include new matter. Support for the amendment to Figure 3 may be found, for example, in the specification as originally filed on page 11, line 29. Support for the amendment to the specification for the paragraph that begins on page 15 line 19 and for the amendment to Figure 4 contained in the replacement sheet for Figure 4 may be found, for example, in claims 16, 21, 26, 38, 44, and 50 as originally filed.

Therefore, the objection to the drawings has been overcome.

II. Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of the informalities listed under items 3, 4, and 5 on page 3 of the Office Action dated December 14, 2007. Appropriate

Application No.: 10/827,056 Attorney Docket No. 119166.1042 Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2007 (72-03-025)

amendments to the specification have been made to correct these informalities. No new matter has been added by these corrections. Therefore, the objection to the specification has been overcome.

III. Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 28, 30, and 32 because of informalities identified on page 4 of the Office Action dated December 14, 2007 under item 6. Claims 28, 30, and 32 have been amended appropriately. Therefore, the objection to claims 28, 30, and 32 has been overcome.

IV. 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-8, 18-22, 30-31, and 40-45 under 35 U.S.C.§101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner states that "[a]s defined in the specification a computer readable medium can be a transmission medium such as a digital and analog communication links (pg. 21 line(s) 4-5)." The specification has been amended at the paragraph that begins on page 20 at line 22 to remove "transmission medium such as digital and analog communications links" from the definition of computer readable medium. Claims 5-8, 18-22, 30-31, and 40-45 should be read in light of the amended specification to not include transmission medium. Therefore, the rejection of claims 5-8, 18-22, 30-31, and 40-45 has been overcome.

V. 35 U.S.C. §102; Anticipation (Claims 1-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-37, 39-43, 45-49, and 51)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-37, 39-43, 45-49, and 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Reznick (US Patent Publication 2003/0014539). This rejection is rendered moot in light of the current amendments to the claims.

Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23, 28, 30, and 32 have been amended to include the limitation "wherein changes to the location of the web site made after the e-mail has been sent to the recipient do not effect the ability of the recipient to access the web site." This feature is neither taught nor suggested by Reznick. Therefore, claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23, 28, 30, and 32 are not anticipated by Reznick. Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29, 31, and 33

Application No.: 10/827,056 Attorney Docket No. 119166.1042 Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2007 (72-03-025)

depend variously from respective ones of claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, 23, 28, 30, and 32. Therefore, Claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 22, 24-25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 are also not anticipated by Reznick. Claims 34-51 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Thus, the rejection of claims 1-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 27-33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome.

VI. 35 U.S.C. §103; Obviousness (Claims 16, 21, 26, 38, 44, and 50)

The Examiner has rejected claims 16, 21, 26, 38, 44, and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reznick. This rejection is rendered moot in light of the amendments to the claims. Claims 16, 21, and 26 depend variously from respective ones of claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, and 23. Therefore, since claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 18, and 23 include limitations not shown or suggested by Reznick, claims 16, 21, and 26 are not rendered obvious by Reznick. The rejection of claims 38, 44, and 50 is rendered moot in light of their cancellation. Thus, the rejection of claims 16, 21, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 has been overcome.

Application No.: 10/827,056

Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 119166.1042

(72-03-025)

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and arguments set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is now in allowable form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of the currently pending claims.

No extension of time in which to file the response is believed to be necessary at this time. If however, an extension is necessary, the extension is hereby requested and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 05-0765. No fees are believed to be due at this time. If this is incorrect, Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees, other than issue fees, that may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 05-0765. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' Attorney for any reason that would advance the current application to issue. Please reference Attorney Docket No. 119166.001042.

Dated: February 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen R. Loe

Registration No. 43,757

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

P.O. Box 649
Frisco, Texas 75034
(972) 741-1331- Telephone
e-mail: loe@friscopatents.com

Customer Number 38851